Serial No. 09/682,899

A F (37-45 RD-27,885

FEB 2 0 2004 P

hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on February 18, 2004 (Date)

Signature: Lita Mr Lynch

#10 Htmled 2-25-04

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: M.R. Jackson et al.

**RECEIVED** 

Application No. 09/682,899

FEB 2 4 2004

: Examiner: J.M. McAleenan

Filed: October 31, 2001

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

: Response to Paper No. 9

For: REPAIR OF ADVANCED GAS TURBINE BLADES

## **RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION**

Assistant Director of Patents and Trademarks United States Patent and Trademark Office Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

Applicants appreciate the consideration shown by the Office as evidenced by the Final Office Action mailed on November 18, 2003. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 28, 30-33, 35-37, 39, 40, 42-44, 46, 47, 64-69, 71-73, 102-117 and 133-140, and objected to claims 13-27, 29, 49-63, 79-101, and 118-132. However, Applicants are unable to make a complete response to the Office Action because the Office Action appears to have been mistakenly drafted, in that the majority of the Office Action addresses an application that is different from the instant case. The Office Action cited inapplicable prior art, referenced non-existent claim limitations, and referenced remarks attributed to Applicants that Applicants never made for the instant case. The undersigned has spoken to the Examiner on three occasions about this defective Office Action and has been assured by the Examiner that the Examiner will provide a corrected Office Action with an adjusted time period for response. Applicants respectfully submit this response merely to document the fact of the defective Office Action and to provide a response prior

to the running of the three-month period stated for the defective Office Action to avoid any question of abandonment. Applicants request the Examiner review the previous Office Action at his earliest convenience, and further request the Examiner consider the following brief remarks.

Applicants did glean from one section of the Office Action that the Examiner had considered Applicants arguments regarding the recitation, in all of the rejected independent claims, of a "freestanding tip insert." Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner appears to be overlooking the significance of the term "freestanding." Applicants refer the Examiner to the following popular dictionary website:

http://www.hyperdictionary.com/search.aspx?define=freestanding&search.x=19&search.y=9 where the following information regarding this term is provided: freestanding definition: [adj] standing apart; not attached to or supported by anything; "a freestanding bell tower"; "a house with a separate garage"; Synonyms: detached, separate. Applicants respectfully submit that a freestanding insert does not include material deposited on a supporting substrate by using any build-up method, as is discussed in all of the references previously cited by the Examiner. None of the references teaches, suggests, or discloses the use of a freestanding insert, in stark contrast to the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of this definition, the instant claims, and the supporting material in the specification.

In light of the remarks presented herein, Applicants submit that the case is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request such action. If, however, any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul DiCorta

Reg. No. 48,418

General Electric Company Building K1, Room 3A60 Telephone: (518) 387-6331

Schenectady, New York Wednesday, February 18, 2004